DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 162 244 CG 013 044

AUTHOR Mechau, Dorik
TITLE Shelter for Abused & Battered Women and Their Children Operated by Abused Women's Aid in Crisis (AWAIC), Anchorage, Alaska. Final Evaluation Report.
PUB DATE 31 Jul 78
NOTE 37p.; Pages 34-37 may be marginally legible

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administration; *Females; *Intervention; Program Costs; Program Evaluation; Rape; Research Projects; *Residential Programs; *Violence
IDENTIFIERS *Alaska (Anchorage); *Battered Women

ABSTRACT

The shelter for battered women described in this report was established for three purposes: (1) to provide assaulted and battered women and their children refuge from domestic violence; (2) to enable women to identify viable alternatives to life-threatening situations and encourage self-reliance; and (3) to act as an advocate for change within the community and in those systems responsible for providing services to assaulted and battered women and their children. The report itself is a detailed final evaluation of the program for the fiscal year ending June, 1978. A few of the areas covered are funding sources and appropriateness of funding; staff positions and salaries; goals and objectives; functions performed by the shelter; and deficiencies and recommendations for improvement. (Author/EP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED162244

CG

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

on

SHELTER FOR ABUSED & BATTERED WOMEN AND THEIR CHILDREN

operated by

ABUSED WOMEN'S AID IN CRISIS (AWAIC)

Anchorage, Alaska

31 July 1978

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. Harvey Pitts

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Submitted to

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL AFFAIRS

DIVISION OF COMMUNITY AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

by

Dorik V. Mechau

Rt. 1, Box 98B, Haines, Oregon 98733

CG013044

I N D E X

Introduction	1
Evaluation Process and Results	2
1. Evaluation Locale	3
2. Analysis of Need for This Program in Anchorage	3
3. Appropriateness of State Funding of This Program	7
4. Other Funding Sources	10
5. Board of Directors - Staff Relationship	12
6. Staff Positions and Job Descriptions	15
7. Appropriateness of Salaries	16
8. Appropriateness of Budget Allocations	17
9. Definition of Goals and Objectives	18
10. Progress Toward Goals and Objectives	19
11. Needs of Clientele	20
12. Functions Performed	22
13. Discussion of Program and Fiscal Management	23
14. Discussion of All Deficiencies Noted	28
15. Recommendations for Improvement	28
Statistical Information	29

Introduction

This evaluation report has been prepared for the Department of Community and Regional Affairs, Division of Community and Rural Development. It is the second of two reports called for under a service contract agreement for evaluation of the shelter for assaulted and battered women and their children operated by Abused Women's Aid in Crisis (AWAIC), Anchorage.

The legislature appropriated $216,000 in 1977 to enable AWAIC to establish this shelter in Anchorage and to operate its program during the fiscal year ending June 1978. Operating budget was actually $211,000, as $5,000 was reserved by the Department to cover evaluation services. The shelter became operational on 15 August, approximately one month after a contract between the Department and AWAIC had been executed. During this period a suitable building was leased and alarm system installed, staff recruited and hired, and the first phase of in-service training commenced.

The following abstract is quoted from the AWAIC proposal to the legislature:

> ### Proposal Summary
>
> This project is designed to establish a shelter and provide support services for abused women and their children. The program will emphasize self-help and increased self-reliance to enable women to assume personal responsibility for their choices and their lives. Provided services will avoid incurring program dependency and recipient attitudes. The shelter will provide space for ten women and their children with an average of thirty to thirty-five residents. Trained staff will be present on a twenty-four hour basis; programs will include crisis intervention, secure shelter, food, medical and legal assistance, professional and para-professional counseling for individuals and families, resource referral, community outreach and research.

The statements below are also extracted from the AWAIC proposal:

Program Objectives

1. To provide assaulted and battered women and their children refuge from domestic violence.
2. To enable women to identify viable alternatives to life-threatening situations and encourage self-reliance.
3. To advocate for change within the community and those systems responsible for providing services to assaulted and battered women and their children.

Methodology

1. To open and operate a residential shelter for assaulted and battered women and their children from one to thirty days with a maximum capacity of thirty persons.
2. To provide a twenty-four hour crisis line.
3. To provide supportive services by:
   a. Offering minimum child care and programs;
   b. Offering crisis intervention counseling as needed to residents. No formal treatment or therapy program will be provided;
   c. Offering transportation as necessary;
   d. Offering system advocates to accompany women through social, medical and legal service procedures.
4. To establish a reciprocal information and referral network with existing state and local services.

Evaluation Process and Results

This evaluation attempts to be responsive to the specific requirements set out by the Department. The evaluation contract calls for three site visits: one in October, one in February, and one at the close of the contract period. Accordingly, these three visits have taken place and provide the basis for this report; a preliminary report was prepared following the second site visit and submitted to the Department in early March.

Few shelters specifically planned to meet the needs of victims of

household violence exist across the country, and those that do have typically been in operation for but a year or two. Because of this circumstance and the scarcity of information on other shelters, no comparative analysis between programs could be attempted in this evaluation. Assessment of performance of the AWAIC shelter is largely conditioned by explicit program objectives and activities, and on terms and conditions of the contract between the Department and AWAIC.

Information, impressions, and opinions from a variety of sources have been obtained in the course of the site visits. Within AWAIC, each of the direct service staff, most of the full-time volunteers (VISTA), and the shelter director have been interviewed, several meetings were held with the staff collectively, with the Chairperson of the AWAIC Board of Directors, with committees of the Board, and two meetings with the full Board. Two shelter residents were interviewed, and contacts made with seven women randomly selected from files of ex-residents. Viewpoints were also obtained from representatives of several state and federal agencies who have made or received referrals, from the State Troopers, the Anchorage Police Department, the court, VISTA, and several private social service organizations.

1. Discussion and evaluation shall be confined to the geographical area of Anchorage.

   Every effort has been made to observe this condition in the course of the evaluation process and in written reports.

2. Analysis of need for this program in Anchorage.

   Is there a continuing need?

   Need for a shelter in Anchorage has been perceived by some of its citizens for many years, usually as a result of contact

with battered women in the process of obtaining medical care or social services. Physical abuse of women within their own homes is apparently perceived by the general public as such an anomaly that it is only rarely regarded as a serious social ill. By its nature, domestic violence is seldom shared with the community at large.

Awareness of the scope of the problem was undoubtedly limited to a small portion of the population until recent years when national attention has focussed on the issue. Such attention may be credited to the civil rights movement generally and to women's rights movements particularly. In Anchorage, the Alaska Women's Resource Center in the early 1970's identified the emergency housing needs of battered women as a priority and repeatedly sought funding for such a purpose with limited success. It was not until March of 1977 that significant public attention was drawn to this and related concerns through a statewide conference on domestic violence, sponsored by the Alaska Women's Resource Center and Cook Inlet Native Association. Within two weeks of the conference, a bill was introduced in the legislature to fund the program now under review.

The above obviously speaks to the need for a shelter as perceived by only a fraction of the Anchorage population. While this evaluation does not include any component to assess public opinion on the program, it seems clear that there is now at least considerably greater public awareness of the situation of battered women than there was just a few years ago.

Arguments advanced on behalf of a shelter program have been based on information not readily available. Some statistics on incidence of battering in Anchorage can be developed through analysis of data available in official police records, and further estimates can be made through informed testimony of individuals who come into contact with the victims and speculation about the extent of unreported incidents.

> "In Anchorage, Captain G. Weaver of the Anchorage Police Department says that no statistics are maintained on the incidence of wife beatings. It is not a separate crime, but may be involved in a police call ultimately classified as a "disturbance", "family disturbance", "disorderly conduct", "assault and battery", or "brandishing of firearms". Computations derived from family disturbance and disorderly conduct calls suggest that in 1975 Anchorage police responded to approximately 1,232 wife beatings in the old City of Anchorage and the Spenard Service Area. This figure reduces to 3.3 reported wife beatings per day, in only a portion of the Anchorage Municipality."
>
> "Most wife beatings, however, go unreported. Other indicia of the rate of wife abuse are, therefore, necessary. Particularly telling is the fact related by Jones, that 70 to 75 percent of the women seeking legal assistance of any kind from Alaska Legal Services acknowledge being beaten by their husbands."
>
> "The medical community has further information. Mona Ravin, Assistant Professor of Community Health Nursing, and President of the Alaska Nurses Association, says that registered nurses "frequently encounter" battered wives in hospitals, doctors' offices, clinics, and community or home settings. And these are only the more serious cases."

These extracts are from the report on The Status of Women in Alaska, 1977, a study commissioned by the state legislature. The full text of the portion of this report dealing with battered wives is strongly recommended to those who are interested

in detailed documentation of need for a shelter program and other assistance to victims of domestic violence.

The statistical information quoted above (which is the same as that used by AWAIC in its proposal to the legislature) cannot be readily validated. My efforts to do so through contact with the Anchorage Police Department demonstrated only that the record-keeping system is essentially as described in the report. The closest I could get to a confirmation of the figures was the comment that they "seem reasonable". No information has come to my attention which raises questions or casts doubt on the validity of data presented by advocates to document need.

A further, more direct measure of need is established by consideration of shelter occupancy data (see attachment). At no time since the AWAIC shelter opened has occupancy fallen to zero. Some 205 different women were provided shelter during the period 15 August 1977 through 30 June 1978.

Information and comment obtained from people in Anchorage, whose work brought them into contact with the shelter, responded positively when asked if it was truly needed.

Some representative samples:

"As far as I'm concerned, it's a good thing to have here."
-Captain, Alaska State Troopers

"Very, very needed." - PHS Social Worker

"Some people in this community have been trying for twenty years to get such a program established; it's really been such a neglected group."
-HSS, Social Service Program Administrator

"Incredibly important to have such a shelter."
-Alaska Hospital, Social Worker

And some representative examples from ex-residents:

"That shelter is the best thing that ever happened to me."

"The idea of that place is great; I'm sure glad it's there."

"I wish to God there had been a shelter like that in Portland when I first started getting beat up."

"I don't know what I would have done if it hadn't been there."

None of the above citations, taken alone, would provide an unassailable argument; taken together, I believe need has been more than adequately demonstrated.

With respect to the question of continued need for a shelter program, it seems clear that if need has been demonstrated for commencement of the program, one is drawn inescapably to the conclusion that the need will continue unless battering stops. This is not to say that some characteristics of the AWAIC shelter as they have taken form during the past year should necessarily remain unaltered in future; program changes and refinements are to be expected as experience and circumstances require. The one feature of this or any other shelter program that can be expected to remain unaltered is physical safety, that essential ingredient seldom available in alternative housing situations, of which there are few in Anchorage. There appears to be no satisfactory alternative to the shelter program.

3. Appropriateness of state funding of this program.

Does this occur elsewhere?

There is ample precedent in Alaska for public funds going to

private organizations for performing specific work under contract. In this instance, the services provided by the AWAIC shelter program are not duplicating in any particular (so far as I can determine) those provided by existing state agencies or private organizations.

The alternative to the state contracting with a private organization is for a shelter program to be operated by a state department, presumably Health and Social Services. The arguments against this are several: further growth of state government, greater cost for given services (particularly because of loss to a governmentally run program of the volunteer services so vital to the AWAIC shelter), and greater constraints in program flexibility. Some might argue that this alterrative is to be preferred because a state department would be more accountable to the public in its use of tax dollars than the private organization under contract to the state. I believe that the public has every reason to be concerned about accountability in either case. Public unease and distrust over governmental accountability do not have to be documented here; on the other hand, no one should assume that a private organization, because it is private, will use public funds wisely and well. Reasonable safeguards should be observed. These I would consider to be external evaluation and an annual fiscal audit.

I made several attempts during the contract period to obtain specific current information on the characteristics of shelter

legislation in other states. These efforts included contacts with organizations concerned with advancing the rights of women. Neither the San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women nor the Oregon Coalition Against Domestic Violence could do other than suggest I contact the Center for Women Policy Studies in Washington, D.C. The result was a list of states where legislation providing for shelter services had been enacted or was pending. A director of the Center told me that to her knowledge no other organization was actively collecting this information. The effective date of the tabulation was January, 1978, and, unfortunately, no new information has been compiled since to provide update. The Center's chart, State Legislation on Domestic Violence, is attached. To summarize that portion of the information dealing with shelter services, the fifteen states indicated below had either passed legislation (1977) or were considering legislation concerning shelter programs.

Legislation Passed	Legislation Pending
Alaska	Florida
California	Iowa
Connecticut	Maine
Maryland	Michigan
Massachusetts	New Jersey
Minnesota	Ohio
Nebraska	
New York	
Oregon	

The dearth of current and detailed information is unfortunate, but the effort to obtain it is well beyond expectation. Indeed, the Director of the Center for Women Policy Studies stated that

the time required to gather data for the chart was far greater than anticipated. An example of the difficulty in obtaining accurate data she cited was the response the Center had received from Alaska's Legislative Affairs Agency, Division of Research Services, that no pertinent legislation was on record.

The chart does not generally provide information concerning the question of public funding going to agencies of the state or to private organizations. Two telephone calls to the Center in June failed to produce any information on this subject; the information was not readily available and staff could not find time to meet my request.

4. Have other funding sources been investigated and mobilized?

As mentioned earlier, prior to passage of H.B. 463 in 1977, and before AWAIC had come into being (incorporation was in January, 1977) fund raising efforts for a shelter were made by the Alaska Women's Resource Center. The Center was successful in obtaining a grant of $12,000 from the United Methodist Church Ministries in 1975 and, while this support and volunteer contributions enabled some women to obtain help, needs clearly were not being met. From its inception, AWAIC concentrated on obtaining public funds because of the difficulties experienced previously in raising adequate money from private sources; such efforts and those of the Women's Resource Center were instrumental in bringing about legislative action.

Since receiving its state contract, AWAIC explored several

possibilities for supplemental funding; HUD and LEAA programs offered some hope, and support from the latter agency for a "male awareness program" is, at this writing, almost a certainty for Fiscal Year 1979. AWAIC operated only the shelter during FY 1978.

The only other sources of funds to date have come through voluntary contributions from residents and from AWAIC membership drives. While this income has amounted to no more than several thousand dollars for the year, it has nonetheless provided for program related expenses incurred by the Board, as no indirect (overhead) cost was included in the FY 1978 budget request to the legislature.

Apart from the above, no specific fund raising efforts have been undertaken. AWAIC is considering seeking financial support from the Municipality of Anchorage for FY 1979.

In my opinion, the shelter cannot, either immediately or in the foreseeable future, generate private funds adequate to cover basic operating costs. First, the shelter deals with a social problem that has forever been kept in the closet. Battering is not something that most people relate to - except with repugnance, uneasiness, wisecracks. The incidence of battering is hard to believe, just as it is hard to understand the forces which propel such behavior. There may or may not be sympathy for the victims, but even when there is, one still feels safer and more secure when some distance is maintained. It is something like the way society has dealt with lepers..... When people, corporations, foundations,

give, typically they do so with the view to supporting something that is socially acceptable and to which they can relate in a positive way. A program for battered women does not easily meet this standard.

Second, even if the shelter was "attractive" to private contributors, Anchorage has a host of long established organizations that have a considerable edge because they are recognized in the community. Some of these organizations struggle for survival year after year, while others are more favored, but I know of none that does not need more money than it receives from the private sector. In this situation, it is extremely difficult for AWAIC to garner significant support.

Recommendations

In my view, the most that reasonably can be expected from the private sector, apart from volunteer time and non-monetary contributions, is occasional program "enrichment" money from such sources as United Way, church groups, civic clubs and organizations, businesses, and perhaps modest foundation grants. I believe AWAIC should carefully move to develop proposals to this end.

5. Is there a proper Board of Directors - Staff relationship? Is there proper separation of policy and administration between Board and Staff?

The relationship between the AWAIC Board members and the shelter staff (i.e., the Program Director, in most instances) was mentioned in my preliminary evaluation report as an area of weakness.

Specifically, I cited irregular and inadequate communications and lack of a formally adopted personnel policy.

Most of the "stress and strain", I noted, seemed to stem from a combination of factors. Members of the Board had wrestled from the outset with questions about the role they should play as "directors". Some expressed a keen personal desire for active involvement in the program, others felt that some distance needed to be maintained. Some felt comfortable with a relaxed, informal relationship between the Board and the Executive Director, others that a structured and more formal relationship would be most helpful to the program. Some appeared to have full confidence that the Director alone could take the reins of the program and effectively carry out all of the developmental and managerial tasks involved, others were uncertain that this was likely without Board involvement or other means of assistance. Different management philosophies, different perceptions of ways and means by which the Board could strengthen the program, appear to have embroiled members for some time. The Program Director, immediately responsible for getting the program underway, found herself sometimes frustrated by indecision of the Board and apparently felt compelled from time to time to act without its formal approval. Some members felt rebuffed in these circumstances, arguing that the Board was not able to function effectively without adequate information coming from the Director. Thus, tensions developed both within the Board and between the Board and the Director.

The question at mid year was whether or not the difficulties would be resolved. It appeared possible that the situation could deteriorate further and damage the program or be turned around to become a more positive and productive relationship. As noted in my earlier report, I found it remarkable that there was no evidence that the situation described had had a discernible negative impact on the program. Stress was the most evident feature.

I am pleased to report that the overall situation at year's end had improved substantially. There appears to be a clearer recognition of specific areas of Board prerogative on the one hand and the Director's on the other. Through reorganization of the Board's committee structure, information flow and communications have been facilitated, and mutual support is far more evident. Other steps taken, all appearing to have positive results, are the recent election to the Board of three ex-residents of the shelter, greater contact between staff and Board members, and election of a new chairperson who is especially well acquainted with the shelter operation.

I conclude that the relationship between the Board and staff is now functional and proper, and that there is reasonable expectation of this continuing.

Recommendations

The Board should complete its consideration of personnel matters and put policy into effect at the earliest possible date.

The Board is encouraged to implement its current planning for occasional retreats with staff to share perspectives on issues of concern.

The staff is encouraged to take advantage of the Board's open invitation to attend its meetings, and Board members are encouraged to attend weekly house meetings at the shelter.

6. Appropriateness of staff positions and job descriptions.

My preliminary report stated:

> "The several positions, covering as they do a variety of duties and responsibilities, appear appropriately differentiated. The job descriptions of these positions are generally adequate in content and conform for the most part to reality. This is not to say some can't be improved. Some changes have taken place in assignments and responsibilities since the inception of the program, but staff structure and position descriptions have remained essentially unaltered."
>
> ("The only 'problem' seen in the roster of positions is the inadequate number of direct service staff. In order to have two such staff on each shift throughout the year and around the clock (and taking into account annual leave and sick leave) nine full-time persons are required versus the five provided for in the budget.")

My recommendation was:

> "Position descriptions for staff should be reviewed and amended as necessary by supervisor and employee on a regular basis, preferably in coincidence with periodic performance evaluations."

At year's end this had not been accomplished. While existing position descriptions need improvement, the typical deficiency is their generality rather than inaccuracy. The positions themselves appear to be appropriate to the operation of the shelter and the services it is responsible for providing.

Recommendations

I urge that position descriptions be brought up to date without further delay, and recommend that this be done with both supervisor and employee involved in the process. The revised positions should be used periodically (I suggest quarterly) to keep them current and as a basis for formal performance evaluation.

7. Appropriateness of staff salaries.

I made an assessment of salary levels of shelter staff in February and no further review has been undertaken. I compared comparable positions (insofar as comparability existed) at McCloughlin Youth Center and at Alaska Childrens Services. The results are as described earlier, namely: salary levels for staff are higher (10%-15%) than pay rates for analogous jobs in the private sector, but slightly lower (about 5%) than the state scale.

The one exception was the position of "Special Assistant" to the Director; this salary level appeared to be higher than similar positions in the state classification system by about 10%. The individual filling this position resigned near the end of the contract year and the person replacing her has a somewhat different set of duties and responsibilities at the shelter at an annual salary of $14,400. No new position description has yet been prepared, but based on conversation with the incumbent and the Director, the position might best be described as "Office-Shelter Manager" with a variety of administrative support functions predominant among the duties. Based on the information available to

me, the salary level is certainly not excessive and may be somewhat low.

Recommendations

If salaries for existing positions are to remain in the same approximate relationship to private and state levels, it would appear that an increase of between 5%-10% would be in order, based on increases in the cost of living index and the boost of non-classified state personnel salaries by 5% retroactive to last January.

8. Appropriateness of Budget Allocations.

Allocation to budget category line items was completed initially during contract negotiations in July of 1978. This was, of course, before there was any physical facility and any prior experience in operating a shelter. Estimates of various cost elements were made by AWAIC based, in part, upon information gathered from others operating programs of a somewhat similar kind. In the circumstances, some of the allocations were highly speculative. In my preliminary report, I said: "Given all the uncertainties in starting a shelter program from scratch, allocations among most budget categories were quite well estimated initially. Some adjustments beyond the 10% limitation on changing category totals will soon need to be made, however."

At this point, it is easy to see that I should have been much more specific in my report recommendations. In February, there was a clear need for the Program Director to request authorization

of the Department to make adjustments among budget category totals. This was not done until late April when some very sizable shifts were made.

I believe that concern should be focussed on the causes of the delay in making budget adjustments rather than on how accurate the allocations were to begin with. This matter is covered in further detail under item 13.

Recommendations

See recommendations under item 13.

9. Are goals and objectives clearly defined and understood?

In my earlier report, I indicated that the AWAIC program proposal appeared to contain "some ambiguities with respect to goals, objectives, and program activities." I felt that a number of statements listed under "Program Objectives" were more properly goals, and most objectives appeared under "Methodology". I felt, too, that there was little detail provided to indicate what activities were planned to advance program objectives and how they would be carried out. I stated further that "whatever the apparent deficiencies, no evidence has been found indicating that there has in fact been any serious problem created by inadequate clarity; on the contrary, interviews with program staff, ex-residents, and others consistently demonstrated a common view of what the shelter was about."

My view of the situation remains the same. I believe the key ingredient in the clarification process was the experience of operating the shelter and allowing needs of residents to serve as

the agent for greater definition of program conduct within the broadly stated parameters of the proposal. While such an approach may well raise questions at the outset (as I can personally attest), it has worked well here. It is indeed seldom that the preconceived ideas of those who write proposals do not interfere with development and implementation of a program around client needs as they come to be recognized.

Recommendations

Review of the FY 1978 program proposal should take place as soon as possible and any needed modifications and refinements made to bring the program description up to date for FY 1979. Every effort should be made to clarify the presentation of goals, objectives, and activities in support of the objectives. This should be done whether or not this is required by the state. The process should include the Board, Director, staff, and to the extent possible, shelter residents.

10. Are goals and objectives being met?

I find the same problem with use of terms in this question as I did in the AWAIC proposal; "goals" and "objectives" are not clearly distinguishable. Goals are properly extremely broad statements of purpose which contain no specific indication of what will be done or how, e.g., "to improve education", "to reduce unemployment", "to advocate for change within the community and those systems responsible for providing services to assaulted and battered women and their children".

I interpret the question to be asking whether or not AWAIC is doing what it said it would do. The answer is affirmative. AWAIC is operating within the framework of the broadly stated principles of its proposal (whether or not they were called "goals"), and objectives have been met (to the extent that the statements of objectives are not overbroad, as in the example mentioned at the end of the paragraph above). All of the program activities undertaken to meet program objectives have been carried out with the possible exception of Item 4 under "Methodology": "to establish a reciprocal information and referral network with existing state and local services". My only problem here is that the statement connotes a more highly structured and formalized system than appears to exist. In practice there generally is an effective level of communication and referral between the shelter and other organizations.

In summary, while some confusion exists with respect to interpretation of the nomenclature - goals, objectives, methodology, and activities - I believe that AWAIC has done what it was contracted to do.

Recommendations

As under item 9 above.

11. Are the needs of clientele being met?

The circumstances of women coming into the shelter vary dramatically, as do their needs. What is common to all is that they are seeking protection against violence. The AWAIC proposal provides

a statement of the services available, broad enough to address a wide range of individual need, but limited in terms of what the staff and program could realistically provide. Within this framework, only the clients themselves can speak to the question directly. The following remarks are typical of the responses to this question of residents and ex-residents whom I interviewed:

> "I don't have any suggestions for improvements. I've gotten much more help than I expected to get and at the same time the staff is always encouraging me to make my own decisions."
>
> "I can't think of anything more the staff could have done to help me. Well, maybe sometimes when the place was jammed with women and kids, I felt desperate because they were just too busy to talk with me, but that wasn't their fault."
>
> "The staff was just very helpful - a warm, supportive group. Didn't tell me what to do, just let me make up my own mind."

Indirect assessment of the shelter program, its services, and particular needs of clients, come from a variety of sources. Typical interview responses are as follows:

> "I don't think she [a client] could have managed to get through the interview process and all the paperwork without the help she got from the shelter. She was just numb and terribly scared."
> -AFDC staffer
>
> "It was a long drawn out court case. The cooperation I got from them [shelter staff] was absolutely terrific. Really dedicated and hard-working; remarkable follow-through."
> -Private attorney representing a resident
>
> "I don't know what she [a client] would have done if the shelter wasn't there. She had no close friends or family here, no money. They [shelter

staff] helped her in every possible way.
-Chaplain, Ft. Richardson

While in every essential aspect of operation the program has lived up to its basic commitments and provided the services specified, a question remains as to the quality of services provided. While no substantial criticisms were heard from clients, some problem areas can be identified from discussions with staff. For example, transportation was indeed provided clients, but it was not necessarily efficient and timely through much of the year. Similarly, assistance to clients in obtaining legal counsel was provided, but sometimes with delays and other problems. In both these instances, the problems were recognized by the shelter staff and the Board, and efforts made to alleviate them. The transportation difficulties were greatly eased by acquisition of a vehicle; improvement in provision of legal assistance had begun before the conclusion of the first year and significant improvements in this area of service are underway. Thus, qualitative aspects of program operation are improving. It seems clear that the staff is its own harshest critic in this regard.

Recommendations

None.

12. Appropriateness of functions performed, i.e., counseling, day care, legal services, etc., by inclusion or omission.

All the functions specified in the AWAIC proposal appear to be necessary and desirable. The question here once again has an important qualitative aspect. For example, one shelter commitment

is "offering minimum child care and programs". What does "minimum" mean when translated into the reality of children who are frightened and often emotionally disturbed? This is a problem the staff and Board wrestled with during the year as recognition grew that what had been thought to be "minimum" in the early stages of operation was inadequate. Upgrading of services for children, the most frequent recommendation I heard from ex-residents, was gradually accomplished and by year's end significant improvement had taken place.

Recommendations

None.

13. Discussion of program and fiscal management.

Administration of the shelter program was uneven during the year. It was strong throughout with respect to program development but sometimes seriously lacking in fiscal management. The delay in establishing personnel policy (for which both the Board and the Director share responsibility) was discussed earlier. Provision of services to clients has been the paramount concern of the Director. In order to guide the program through the developmental phases of the first year, she gave most of her time and attention to program implementation, staff and clients. For more than six months into the program, the shelter was short of staff and the Director was frequently involved in providing direct services, thereby reducing the time available for management tasks.

Anticipating the need for administrative support to the Director, the Board had included a "Special Assistant" in the program budget.

The person filling this position left her job after only a few months when her husband was transferred from Alaska. There appears to be some reason to believe that she was not particularly well-qualified - or at least was not able to discharge fully her considerable responsibilities with respect to accounting and office management. A replacement with greater accounting experience was hired and served until the end of the program year. While the bookkeeping apparently improved considerably, the Director did not give needed attention to fiscal matters.

It should be emphasized that throughout the year the Director took an extremely conservative course with respect to spending; there is no indication of casual or unnecessary expenditures but, to the contrary, every evidence that available funds were not spent on important program needs. This is not to say that the Director was unwilling to spend these funds, but rather that she was uncertain or unaware that she had an unobligated surplus accumulating.

The biggest factor in this surplus was a far lower cost for shelter food supplies than had been expected and budgeted for. The original estimate included in the budget was $36,000; the expected cost as revised in April was $16,300, or a difference of $19,700. Upon request from the Director in April, the Department approved reallocation of $19,000, $2,300 going to increase the travel budget and $16,700 going to the equipment category. Of this latter amount, $10,000 was for purchase of a van for meeting

transportation needs, with the balance designated for purchase of more beds, linens, pillows, blankets, cribs, high chairs, playpens, bureaus, sofas, and miscellaneous office equipment. All of the items mentioned appear to be fully justified in terms of need.

The program financial report for June was not yet available at the time of this writing, but I understand the trial balance for unexpended funds at the end of the fiscal year was approximately $15,000, with only a few bills remaining to be paid.

Thus, the combined total of the recent, originally unbudgeted, expenditures and the unexpended balance is in the vicinity of $30,000, or approximately 14% lower than original expectations. While I commend economizing, there is no question in my mind that the effectiveness of the program, and especially the quality of services to clients, could have been improved with the timely expenditure of the funds mentioned. By the end of January, the budget report clearly showed that some adjustments were in order: travel was already overexpended, and less than $7,500 had been expended from the $36,000 allotment. The balance left for food for the remainder of the program year was therefore $28,500, or an average of $5,700 per month - more than double the original estimated cost.

I have described this situation in detail because it reflects the most serious management deficiency evident. And while the immediate responsibility clearly rests with the Director, a severe weakness is exposed with respect to the Board's process of

reviewing monthly financial reports.

A positive and appropriate step (if rather late) was taken in late spring when a certified public accountant was engaged to evaluate the adequacy of accounting records and documentation and to furnish a report to the Board. This was accomplished on 6 June and resulted in a number of recommendations for improvement of accounting procedures. Also, following the resignation of the Special Assistant, the CPA was contracted to provide on-going accounting services for the shelter program. This action was well taken and should serve to strengthen considerably the soundness of the accounting process.

The Director has gained important experience in administration generally and in financial management particularly. There is good reason to believe that in future more time and attention will be given to matters of program administration, especially as most organizational and operational aspects of the shelter are well under control.

Recommendations

Services of a CPA to perform accounting functions should be maintained during FY 1979, and his advice and assistance sought as necessary by the Director and the Board. To facilitate communication and counselling, I suggest that the Director meet with him on a monthly basis for a discussion of any specific questions or problems that may have arisen, and to consider longer term perspectives of expenditure rates and adjustments to budget.

Similarly, I would urge the Board (or the Budget and Finance Committee) to meet at least quarterly with the accountant.

The Director should assign such administrative duties and responsibilities to her assistant as this person may reasonably be expected to handle, keeping in mind that there are many management decisions which can best be made, or only be made, by the Director.

Projections of monthly expenditures, beginning with the new fiscal year, should be prepared by the Director with the assistance of the accountant. Projections versus actual expenditures plus obligations should be maintained throughout the year to provide all those concerned with useful information.

Once the Board has approved a personnel policy, the Director should make every effort to observe the conditions it contains. Problems with application of the policy (which will certainly arise from time to time) should be brought to the attention of the Board without delay.

Periodic retreats of staff and Board members are encouraged as useful in sharing concerns and in development of mutual support. I would recommend that a "facilitator" from outside the ranks of staff and Board be considered to assist in this process.

Consideration should be given by the Board to engaging the services of someone competent to assist members from time to time in developing their collective capacity to function with increased effectiveness. Similarly, thought should be given to ways and means of providing the Director with specific training

or guidance as may be considered helpful.

Finally, I recommend that an independent external evaluator be retained to assess program management and operations during FY 1979 and urge that it be a woman. The reason for this is my conviction that thorough assessment of shelter operations demands extended visits to the shelter which are at best awkward and at worst highly upsetting to the residents where the evaluator is male.

14. Discussion of all deficiencies noted.

All deficiencies noted are discussed under the individual headings above.

15. Recommendations for improvement.

All recommendations for improvement are provided under the individual headings above.

Statistical Information

The information provided below is summarized from monthly and quarterly reports prepared by the shelter staff. Unless otherwise noted, the period covered is from 15 August 1977 through 30 June 1978.

A. Clients/Children

1.	# Client intakes	248
2.	# Client days	2,989
3.	# Children	353
4.	# Children Days	4,167
5.	# Discharges	265

Home: 109 Relatives: 29 Friends: 44
Independent Household: 60 Unknown: 23

6.	# Repeaters (different women)	43
7.	# Women in shelter	High : 15 Low : 1

B. Volunteers

1.	VISTA	1 full-time from September 1977 3 full-time from October 1977 3 full-time from March 1978
2.	Other volunteers (through May only)	2,047 hours (includes staff relief, child care, safe homes for shelter overflow, transportation, other)

C. Referrals from Agencies/others

Women Against Assault
Teamster's Legal Services
Hospitals
Alaska Women's Resource Center
Salvation Army
Kenai Women's Resource Center
Alaska Legal Services
Dept. of Health and Social Services
Crisis Line
Project Help
Seward Social Services
Central Peninsula Mental Health
Physicians
Anchorage Police Dept.
Alaska State Troopers
Alaska Native Medical Center
Open Door Clinic
WIN
Newspaper articles
T.V., radio
Friends
Self-referral
Counselors
Fairbanks Rape Center

D. Referrals to Agencies/others

Alaska Legal Services
A.F.D.C.
Food Stamp Program
Psychiatrists
Anchorage Police Dept.
Hospitals
Neighborhood Health Clinic
Early Screening
Project Help
Metrocenter
Attorneys
Emergency Room
Alanon
Alaska Clinic
A.W.R.C.
Troopers
A.A.
Child Care
Churches
National Guard
Alaska Legal Clinic
District Attorney
C.I.N.A.
Mental Health
B.I.A.
W.I.C.
W.I.N.
ASHA
ALSC

STATE LEGISLATION ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

The following is a chart of the major provisions of state legislation generated by the concern about battered women that has grown over the past several years. The statutory material was collected with the help of the contacts for each state listed in the last issue of RESPONSE. These laws and pending legislation were assembled in January, 1978, and no systematic attempt has been made to update the information. Recent changes in the information that have come to our attention, however, are reflected on the chart. We have also included older, comprehensive laws of the District of Columbia, Hawaii, and New York that deal with domestic violence. Similar statutes of other states may have been omitted because the criminal and civil codes of each state were not researched. The chart was composed for CWPS by Barbara Harvis, a third-year law student at Georgetown University Law Center.

STATE	CIVIL REMEDIES—INJUNCTIVE RELIEF	SHELTER SERVICES	DATA COLLECTION	POLICE TRAINING	SPECIAL CRIMINAL STATUTES	CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS
ALABAMA						
ALASKA		*Laws of Alaska, Ch 72 (1977)* • Shelter in Anchorage for one year • Appropriation $216,000				
ARIZONA						
ARKANSAS						
CALIFORNIA	*Laws of Calif., Ch. 720 (1977)* • Includes cohabitants • TRO for maximum of 30 days • *Ex parte*† relief: "great or irreparable injury" • Relief is independent of Marriage Dissolution Proceeding • Copy of order to LEA if requested by ∗ • Violation: Misdemeanor	*Laws of Calif., Ch 892 (1977)* • Statewide network of 4-6 pilot centers • Appropriations: $280,000 • Data collection • Confidentiality of information	*Laws of Calif., Ch 908 (1977)* • Separates reporting of spouse abuse and child abuse		*Laws of Calif., Ch 912 (1977)* • Makes spouse abuse a felony • Includes cohabitants • Penalty: Imprisonment for not greater than 1 year.	
COLORADO	*HB 1633 (Pending)* "Domestic Violence Abuse and Protection Act" • See Penn. law* • Includes additional police enforcement and reporting provisions (temporary custody not to exceed 24 hours for violation of order and likelihood of assault)		*HB 1633 (Pending)* • Recordkeeping requirements by police • Annual statistical compilation by general assembly			
CONNECTICUT	*Pub. Act No. 77-336 (1977)* • PO: Hearing within 14 days of application Relief includes RO and VO • Maximum duration: 90 days unless action for marriage dissolution commenced • Copy of order to applicant upon request • Non-exclusive remedy†† • *Ex parte*† relief: "immediate and present physical danger"	*Special Act No. 77-87 (1977)* • Pilot program for shelter services • Appropriation: $75,000				
DELAWARE						
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	*DC Code, Title 16, Ch 10 (1977)* • Includes cohabitants • PO: Relief includes RO, mandatory counseling • Maximum duration: 1 year • *Ex parte*† relief: "safety or welfare . . . is immediately endangered" • Penalty: Contempt • No husband-wife privilege in proceedings					
FLORIDA		*HB 74 (Pending)* • Establishment and funding of diagnostic intervention centers • Educational and informational programs • Spouses only • Confidentiality of information • Mandatory police referral			*Subsection 901.15(6) (Chap 77-87), Fla. Statutes (1977)* • Provides for warrantless arrest when abuse not in officer's presence	
GEORGIA						
HAWAII					*Sec 709-906, Haw.l Pe. al Code (1973):* • Makes spouse abuse a misdemeanor • Warrantless arrest if abuse in officer's presence • 3 hour cooling off period if abuse not in officer's presence • Violation: Arrest • Record expungement provision *HB 742 (Pending)* • Provides for warrantless arrest when abuse not in officer's presence	

Abbreviations in chart

PO = PROTECTION ORDER
RO = RESTRAINING ORDER
VO = VACATE ORDER
TRO = TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER
LEA = LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY
Δ = DEFENDANT
∗ = PLAINTIFF
TOP = TEMPORARY ORDER OF PROTECTION

Footnotes

† Relief is without notice to the defendant.

* Provisions are substantially the same as those listed on the chart under the Pennsylvania "Protection form Abuse Act" of 1976. Additional provision not found in the Pennsylvania law are listed.

†† Relief is "in addition to" any other available civil or criminal remedies.

STATE	CIVIL REMEDIES—INJUNCTIVE RELIEF	SHELTER SERVICES	DATA COLLECTION	POLICE TRAINING	SPECIAL CRIMINAL STATUTES	CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS
IDAHO						
ILLINOIS	*Ch 69 Sect. 25, Laws of IL (1977)* • Spouses only • Injuctions include RO, VO for maximum of 30 days; temporary custody, counseling • *Ex parte*† relief: "immediate and present danger of abuse"					
INDIANA						
IOWA	*HF 2267 (Pending)* "Protection from Domestic Abuse Act" • Includes cohabitants • PO or consent agreement; hearing within 10 days • Relief includes RO, VO, possession of residence or alternate housing for Δ, temporary custody or visitation • Δ has right to counsel • Defines PO violation ("mere presence on premises" = violation of eviction or alternate housing order) • Max. duration of PO: 1 year • *Ex parte*† relief: "present danger of domestic abuse" • Emergency night and weekend relief • Non-exclusive remedy†† • Violation: Contempt (Jail sentence may be on weekends)	*HF 2147 (Pending)* • Includes cohabitants • Authorizes counties to provide emergency shelter and support services *S 2057 (Pending)* • Funding for four pilot shelter and support programs • Educational programs • Uniform method of data collection and evaluation • Appropriation: $500,000	*S 2057 (Pending)* • Mandatory data collection by hospitals, doctors, nurses, and police *HF 2267 (Pending)* • Mandatory collection of data by state and local LEAs • Information relayed to central registry for child abuse • Limits access to registry information • Confidentiality of records			
KANSAS	*SB 579 (Pending)* "Protection from Abuse Act" • See Penn. law* • Support payments; costs and attorneys fees • Provision for possession of personal property					
KENTUCKY	*HB 499 (Failed 1978)* "Domestic Abuse Act" • See Penn. law* • Definition of abuse includes threat to commit crime likely to result in substantial property damage • Mandatory arrest if probable cause to believe assault or violation of PO • Police transportation to hospital or doctor • Police must inform victim of right to seek criminal or civil action • Husband-wife privilege shall not be used as exclusion grounds when evidence of abuse *KRS 403.270 (Amended 1978)* "Child Custody Act" • Abandonment of house where abuse is threatened not relevant in custody cases	*HB 750 (Failed 1978)* "Prevention and Treatment of Domestic Violence Act" • Establishes Governor's Commission on Domestic Violence • Authorizes six shelter facilities • Education program • Standard system for collecting and analyzing data • Appropriation: $1,000,000	*HB 750 (Failed 1978)* • Mandatory data collection by social service agencies and LEAs • Annual reports to Governor			
LOUISIANA						*SCR 21 (1977):* • Requests La. Department of Health and Human Resources to study problem
MAINE		*LD 2074 (Failed)* • Establishment of emergency shelters • Appropriation: $200,000				
MARYLAND		*Md Ann Code, art 88a, 101-105 (Supp. 1977)* • Spouses only • Establishment of model shelter home	*HJR 32 (Failed)* • Recordkeeping by state police of incidents and resolutions			*HJR 32 (Failed):* • Recordkeeping by state police of incidents and resolutions
MASSACHUSETTS		*Chap 647 (1977)* • Establishes temporary supportive residences *H 1821 (Pending)* • Victims of domestic violence included in assistance programs to persons deprived of living quarters				
MICHIGAN	*HB 6127 (Pending)* "Protection from Abuse Act" • See Penn. law* • More expansive relief (support orders, possession of residence) • Penalty for contempt, imprisonment for not greater than 6 months, fine not greater than $1,000, or both • Δ does not have right to jury trial *HB 5350 (Pending)* • Violation of preliminary injunctive order = felony *HB 5351 (Pending)* • Proof of service of preliminary injunctive order must be filed with LEA *HB 5352* • Mandatory filing with LEA of RO in divorce actions by clerk	*HB 5355 (Pending)* • Establishment of temporary supportive residences • Includes cohabitants • Data collection • Appropriation: $500,000 *HB 5306 (Pending)* • Establishment of pilot assistance center • Includes cohabitants • Data collection • Appropriation: $500,000 *HB 5281 (Pending)* • Establishment of shelter	*HB 5353 (Pending)* • Uniform crime reporting system by local and state police	*HB 5354 (Pending)* • Police training in investigation of domestic assault cases	*HB 5349 (Pending)* • Includes cohabitants • Warrantless arrest when abuse not in police officer's presence • Mandatory arrest if probable cause to believe violation of preliminary injunctive order or peace bond *HB 5356 (Pending)* • Special probation provision for spouse with no previous convictions, may require mandatory counselling	*HCR 108 (1977):* • Creates special committee to study the problem

STATE	CIVIL REMEDIES—INJUNCTIVE RELIEF	SHELTER SERVICES	DATA COLLECTION	POLICE TRAINING	SPECIAL CRIMINAL STATUTES	CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS
MINNESOTA		*Chap 428 (S.F. 124) (1977)* • Establishment of four pilot shelter programs • Includes cohabitants • Educational program • Data collection and evaluation • Assistance to displaced homemakers • Appropriation: $500,000, plus $100,000 for displaced homemakers	*Chap 428 (S.F. 124) (1977)* • Mandatory reporting of data by hospitals, doctors, nurses, and LEAs			
MISSISSIPPI						
MISSOURI	*HB 1023 (Pending)* • See Penn. law* • Right to relief not affected by self defense or by leaving residence to avoid abuse • No execution of bond by petitioner • Attorney fees paid by Δ if Δ loses • Relief is independent of marriage dissolution proceedings • Emergency night relief • Temporary custody (20 hrs) for abuse and violation of court order		*HB 1023 (Pending)* • LEA recordkeeping requirements • Confidentiality of records • Immunity to recordkeepers	*HB 1023 (Pending)* • Establishment of domestic crisis teams		
MONTANA						*HJR 103 (Failed):* • Requests study of battered spouse needs
NEBRASKA	*LB 623 (1978)* "Protection from Domestic Abuse Act" • Includes cohabitants • Relief includes TRO and TVO • *Ex parte*† relief: "irreparable harm, loss, or damage" • Applicant gets two free copies of order	*LB 623 and LB 623a (1978)* • Establishes comprehensive support services to victims, families, and abusers. • Compilation of statistical data • Confidentiality of information • Appropriation: $176,000 for three pilot shelters		*LB 623 (1978)* • Education and training program for LEA	*LB 623 (1978)* • Mandatory counseling as condition of probation for abuser	
NEVADA						
NEW HAMPSHIRE						
NEW JERSEY	*S 3156 (Pending)* "Battered Persons Act" • See Penn law*	*A3168 (Pending)* • Establishes shelters and comprehensive services • Includes cohabitants		*A 3170 (Pending)* • Special police training	*A 3171 (Pending)* • Person accused of assault, assault and battery or atrocious assault and battery may be kept away from marital residence for up to 72 hours.	
NEW MEXICO						
NEW YORK	*Family Court Act, Art. 8, NY Jud. Law (McKinney) amended by Chap. 449 (S 6617-A8842) (1977):* • Spouses only • Initial concurrent jurisdiction in family court and criminal court, but exclusive remedy • PO (restraining, vacate, visitation, custody) Maximum duration: 1 year • *Ex parte*† relief • Notice of PO to LEA • Violation: Maximum of 6 months jail • Conciliation procedures (pre-filing of petition): Probation services, written agreements (court may enter PO in accordance with agreement)	*Chap 450 (S6618-A8843), Laws of NY (1977)* • Permits Board of Social Welfare to approve establishment and operation of shelter homes	*Chap 449 (S 6617-A8842) laws of NY (1977)* • Compilation of data by judiciary		*Chap 449 (S6617-A8842) laws of NY (1977)* • Gives criminal courts power to issue TOP as condition of pre-trial release, and, upon conviction, to enter PO. • Copy of order to police	
NORTH CAROLINA						
NORTH DAKOTA						
OHIO	*HB 835 (Pending)* • See Penn. law*	*HB 1080 (Pending)* • Loan and grant program for purchase or renovation of buildings to be used as shelter; max. loan for 1 building: $75,000. *HB 987 (Pending)* • Establishes program of family protective services • Include cohabitants • Recordkeeping provision • Appropriation: $5,000,000			*HB 957 (Pending)* • Makes second or subsequent criminal assault against spouse a felony of 4th degree • Includes cohabitants • PO during pendency of action, 24 hour/day court, copy of order to LEA • Probation provision (suspended sentence) if participation in psychological treatment programs	
OKLAHOMA	*HB 1620 (Pending)* "Protection of Household Members from Abuse Act" • See Penn. law*					

STATE	CIVIL REMEDIES—INJUNCTIVE RELIEF	SHELTER SERVICES	DATA COLLECTION	POLICE TRAINING	SPECIAL CRIMINAL STATUTES	CONCURRENT RESOLUTION
OREGON	*Chap 845 (HB 2438), Oregon laws (1977)* "Abuse Prevention Act" • Includes cohabitants • Relief includes TRO, injunction or consent agreement, temporary custody or visitation • Maximum duration: 1 year • No undertaking required • Relief not affected by leaving household to avoid abuse • Non-exclusive remedy†† • Petitioner must deliver copy of order to LEA • Mandatory arrest for violation of restraining order. May be released on bail pending contempt hearing • Limits criminal and civil liability of arresting officer	*Chap 848 (SB 769), Oregon Laws (1977)* • Grants for programs (including shelters) designed to prevent, identify and treat domestic violence			*Chap 845, Ore. Laws (1977)* • Provides for mandatory arrest (unless victim objects) if police officer has probable cause to believe assault or fear of assault on spouse • Includes cohabitants • Limits criminal and civil liability for arresting officer	
PENNSYLVANIA	*Act 218, Laws of PA (1976)* "Protection from Abuse Act" • Includes cohabitants • Right to relief not affected by leaving household to avoid abuse • PO or consent agreements: Hearing within 10 days of filing petition, proof by preponderance of evidence, Δ has right to counsel. Relief include: RO, VO, possession of residence, temporary custody and visitation, alternate housing. Maximum duration: 1 year • *Ex parte*† relief: "immediate and present danger of abuse" • Emergency weekend relief • Copy of order to Δ, ∗, and LEA • Non-exclusive remedy†† • Violation: contempt	*SB 964 (Pending)* Amends Act 218 • Clarifies when ∗ may gain possession of household • Provides that relief may include support order • Emergency relief by Philadelphia municipal court judge • Violation: indirect criminal contempt, maximum penalty 6 months in prison, $1,000 fine, or both, no right to jury trial • Warrantless arrest for violation of order if probable cause (whether or not in presence of arresting officer)				
RHODE ISLAND					*77-S-1009, Chap 259, RI Public Law (1977)* • Makes domestic assault a misdemeanor • Includes cohabitants • Arrest must be made within 24 hours after commission of crime • No recognizance requirement	
SOUTH CAROLINA		*S 795 (Pending)* • Includes cohabitants • Establishes pilot programs for shelter and support services • Community education program • Data collection and program evaluation				
SOUTH DAKOTA	*SB 335 (failed)* • Provides for RO and VO • *Ex parte*† relief					
TENNESSEE					*Tenn. Code Ann Sect. 39-602 (1976)* • Makes domestic assault a misdemeanor	
TEXAS						
UTAH						
VERMONT						
VIRGINIA	*Code of VA 16.1-279 (amended) 1978* • Court order for counseling or treatment for either spouse • Δ may have to pay for shelter care	*HB 683 (Pending)* • Two-year pilot shelter program • Department of Welfare pays one-half cost for shelter				
WASHINGTON						
WEST VIRGINIA	*HB 1082 (Pending)* • Includes cohabitants • Right to relief not affected by leaving household to avoid abuse • PO or consent agreements: include RO, possession of residence or VO, custody to party with possession. • Maximum duration: 10 days (renewable for 10 days) • *Ex parte*† relief: only after notice to Δ, hearing within 72 hours, "immediate and present danger of abuse" • Non-exclusive remedy†† • Violation: contempt • No husband/wife privilege under the act.					
WISCONSIN						*AJR 36 (Pending):* • Directs legislative council to study the problem of abuse of spouses
WYOMING						